

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. The claims stand rejected as anticipated by, or obvious in view of Leighton.

The rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 requires "software for *automatically – without user intervention* – analyzing content stored in said memory for plural-bit digital watermark data."

Leighton has no teaching of such an arrangement.

The Action cited Leighton at col. 3, lines 56-67 for such limitation. However, that passage does not say that Leighton provides "software for *automatically – without user intervention* – analyzing..." For example, at col. 3, line 59, Leighton speaks of "computing ... derived values." However, he does not say that this is done automatically, without user intervention. Likewise, at col. 3, lines 61 and 63, Leighton speaks of "retrieving..." and "subtracting..." but again does not teach that such acts are done "automatically, without user intervention."

Each of the claims dependent from claim 1, as well as claim 11 and each of the claims dependent from it, likewise requires an arrangement characterized by "*automatically – without user intervention* – analyzing ..."

Since Leighton fails to teach this limitation of the claims, applicant respectfully submits that the rejections should be withdrawn. (In view of such shortcoming, other points that might be made concerning the rejections, the cited art, and the claims, are not belabored.)

An IDS is submitted herewith. The Examiner's attention is particularly drawn to claim 7 of commonly-owned patent 6,553,129, which is drawn to related subject matter.

Favorable reconsideration is solicited.

Date: January 18, 2005

**Customer Number 23735**

Phone: 503-469-4800  
FAX 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William Y. Conwell  
Registration No. 31,943